EXHIBIT 13

```
1
              UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
            FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
 2.
                    EASTERN DIVISION
 3
      IN RE: NATIONAL
 4
                              ) MDL No. 2804
      PRESCRIPTION
      OPIATE LITIGATION
 5
                              ) Case No.
                                 1:17-MD-2804
 6
      THIS DOCUMENT RELATES ) Hon. Dan A.
 7
      TO ALL CASES
                              ) Polster
 8
                WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 2019
 9
       HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER
10
                 CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW
11
12
                Videotaped deposition of Anna
13
     Lembke, M.D., held at the offices of Lieff
14
     Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, 275
15
     Battery Street, 29th floor, San Francisco,
16
     California, commencing at 8:07 a.m., on the
17
     above date, before Carrie A. Campbell,
     Registered Diplomate Reporter and Certified
18
19
     Realtime Reporter.
20
21
22
23
               GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES
24
            877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
                     deps@golkow.com
25
```

```
1
           that the Cochrane analysis had a huge
 2
           impact on physicians' perception of
 3
           risk --
 4
     QUESTIONS BY MS. VICARI:
 5
                   I didn't ask about the Cochrane
           0.
     analysis. I have limited time. I asked
 6
 7
     about the McIlwain study.
 8
                   MR. ARBITBLIT: Limited time or
 9
           not, Counsel, you're supposed to let
10
           her finish.
11
                   THE WITNESS: I think I did
12
           answer it.
13
     QUESTIONS BY MS. VICARI:
14
                  You can't identify any
           0.
15
     physicians, correct?
16
                   MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.
17
                   THE WITNESS: Again, I think
18
           that I've answered this before in
19
           other ways, with other defendants
20
           asking similar questions, that
21
           although I don't -- I can't identify
22
           any specific physicians. Broadly this
23
           is misleading marketing messages. We
24
           were all exposed to them in the '90s
25
           and ongoing to today.
```

```
1
                   And it had a significant and
           instrumental effect on the way that we
 2
 3
           prescribe opioids.
 4
     QUESTIONS BY MS. VICARI:
 5
                  Dr. Lembke, you would agree
           0.
     with me that as a general matter, a patient's
 6
 7
     exposure to an ineffective medical treatment
 8
     should be minimized, correct?
 9
                   MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.
10
           Incomplete hypothetical.
11
                   THE WITNESS: It says here --
12
           can you restate because it says
13
            "shouldn't be minimized." But I think
14
           you meant should be minimized.
15
     QUESTIONS BY MS. VICARI:
16
                   That is a mistake in the
           0.
17
     transcript.
18
                   You would agree with me that a
19
     patient's exposure to an ineffective medical
20
     treatment should be minimized?
21
                   MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.
22
                   THE WITNESS: I do agree with
23
           that.
24
                   MS. VICARI: Thank you. I have
25
           no further questions. We can go off
```

```
1
            the record. I'll pass the witness.
 2
                   VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now going
 3
            off the record, and the time is
            5:07 p.m.
 4
 5
             (Off the record at 5:07 p.m.)
 6
                   VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now going
 7
            back on the record, and the time is
 8
            5:08 p.m.
9
                    CROSS-EXAMINATION
10
     QUESTIONS BY MS. HOLLY:
11
                   My name is Pam Holly. I'm an
            Ο.
12
     attorney with Morgan Lewis, and we represent
13
     Teva Pharmaceuticals, USA, Cephalon, Inc.,
14
     Actavis Pharma, Watson Laboratories and
15
     Actavis, LLC.
16
                   Are you familiar -- or are you
17
     aware that Watson Laboratories is a party to
18
     this action?
19
            Α.
                   I was not aware.
20
                   Is it fair to say that you
            0.
21
     don't know what opioid medications they sell?
22
                   I know what opioids Teva
            Α.
23
     Pharmaceuticals sells, so if that's all part
24
     of the same entity, Actiq and Fentora.
25
            Ο.
                   So is it fair to say that you
```

- don't know what opioids Watson Labs sells,
- 2 correct?
- A. Correct.
- 4 Q. Are you aware that Actavis
- 5 Pharma is a part of this litigation?
- 6 A. I believe that Actavis Pharma
- 7 was mentioned in combination with Allergan.
- Q. A different entity, not Actavis
- 9 Pharma.
- 10 A. Okay. Okay.
- 11 Q. So it's fair to say that you're
- 12 not aware that Actavis Pharma is a party to
- this litigation?
- 14 A. It's fair to say that I'm not
- aware of the various mergers, and it is very
- 16 confusing. So I'm not entirely aware of who
- owned what when.
- Q. Are you aware that Actavis,
- 19 LLC, is a party to this litigation?
- 20 A. I wasn't aware, but I am aware
- 21 now.
- Q. Are you aware of what opioid
- medications they sell?
- 24 A. No.
- Q. Are you aware that generic

- 1 manufacturers do not -- excuse me, do not
- 2 market their products?
- A. I wasn't specifically aware of
- 4 that, no.
- 5 Q. Are you aware that Teva
- 6 Pharmaceuticals USA is a party to this
- 7 litigation?
- A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Do you know what products Teva
- 10 Pharmaceuticals --
- 11 A. Actiq and Fentora.
- 12 Q. Your report makes no reference
- to Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, so it's fair to
- say that you can't offer an opinion to a
- reasonable degree of medical certainty about
- the marketing of Teva USA; is that correct?
- 17 A. I disagree. If they're named
- in the complaint, and I see all the
- defendants as party to the litigation, and --
- Q. Any -- pardon me.
- A. Go ahead. Go ahead.
- Q. I was going to ask you to point
- me to a reference in your report to Teva
- 24 Pharmaceuticals USA.
- We may have to go off the

- 1 record, but I only have five minutes.
- 2 A. Sorry. Yeah. There's no
- 3 specific reference in my report to Teva
- 4 Pharmaceuticals, but if they're named in the
- 5 complaint, I believe -- I agree with the
- 6 complaint, and my report applies to all the
- defendants in particular as pertains to the
- 8 misrepresentation of the benefits and risks
- 9 of opioids more broadly as a class of drugs.
- 10 Q. So Appendix I of your report
- 11 has five sections, correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 0. And none of those five sections
- 14 relate to Teva Pharmaceuticals or Cephalon,
- 15 correct?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- Q. So it's fair to say that in
- your report, you're not offering an opinion
- in this litigation about the marketing
- 20 conducted by those entities, correct?
- A. No. I feel like I answered
- that question already.
- Q. Well, I don't -- I disagree
- with all due respect.
- There's no section -- what is

```
the title of Appendix I?
1
2.
           A. Appendix I?
3
           Q. In the table of contents, you
     refer to it as misleading promotional
5
     messages, correct?
6
           Α.
                  Yes.
7
                  MR. ARBITBLIT: That's it.
8
           Thank you, Counsel. It's been nice.
9
           Feel free to take whatever is left
10
           over at the end, sandwiches, I mean.
11
                  VIDEOGRAPHER: Shall we
12
           conclude?
13
                  MR. ARBITBLIT: Yes.
14
                  VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This
15
           concludes the video deposition of Anna
16
           Lembke. We are --
17
                  MS. HOLLY: I'm sorry, I did
18
           not have five minutes.
19
                  MS. DO AMARAL: You did.
20
                  MS. HOLLY: I did not have five
21
           minutes.
22
                  VIDEOGRAPHER: I have five.
23
                  MS. HOLLY: I am --
24
                  MR. ARBITBLIT: What does your
25
           timer say, Pam? Have you timed
```

```
1
            yourself?
 2
                   MS. HOLLY: Yeah, my time is
 3
            three minutes.
 4
                   MS. DO AMARAL: No. No, sorry.
 5
                   MR. ARBITBLIT: No.
 6
                   MS. DO AMARAL: Your
 7
            codefendants, the videographer, and by
 8
            my count --
 9
                   MS. HOLLY: All right. I'm
10
            going to state for the record that I
11
           have specific time to ask questions
12
            that I intended to ask on behalf of my
13
            clients, and I object and don't agree
14
            to close the deposition, and I reserve
15
            all rights to raise with the Court to
16
            request the appropriate relief,
17
            including any deposition testimony
18
            that went unanswered here today.
19
                   MR. ARBITBLIT: Well, let's do
20
            two more minutes, Pam, and ask your
21
            questions. Let's not fight about two
22
            minutes.
23
                   MS. HOLLY: Okay. Well, then I
24
            need -- I need -- I need full two
25
            minutes.
```